FOR THE SOUTH	O STATES DISTRICT COURT ERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA SWICK DIVISION
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. JUAN RANGEL-RUBIO,))) CASE NO.) 4:18-CR-274-LGW-CLR-2))
SENTENCING HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE LISA GODBEY WOOD April 10, 2023; 10:34 a.m. Brunswick, Georgia APPEARANCES:	
For the Government:	TANIA D. GROOVER, Esq. U. S. Attorney's Office P. O. Box 8970 Savannah, Georgia 31412 (912) 201-2552 tania.groover@usdoj.gov
For the Defendant:	KATIE A. BREWINGTON, Esq. The Brewington Law Firm, LLC P. O. Box 11153 Savannah, Georgia 31412 (912) 704-0858 kabrewington@gmail.com
Reported by:	Debbie Gilbert, RPR, CCR Official Court Reporter 801 Gloucester Street Post Office Box 1894 Brunswick, GA 31521-1894 (912) 262-2608 or (912) 266-6006 debra_gilbert@gas.uscourts.gov

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: Good morning. 3 SPEAKERS: Good morning. THE COURT: Ms. Sharp, call the case. 4 5 THE CLERK: United States of America versus Juan 6 Rangel-Rubio, Tania Groover for the Government, Katie Brewington 7 for the Defense. MS. GROOVER: Good morning. The United States is ready 8 9 to proceed. 10 MS. BREWINGTON: Good morning, Judge. Defense is ready 11 as well. 12 THE COURT: Ms. Brewington, approach with your client, Mr. Juan Rangel-Rubio, and let me have our interpreter as well 13 14 as our reserve interpreter approach to receive the oath, and, 15 Ms. Sharp, if you will administer it. 16 (Interpreters sworn.) THE COURT: Thank you. All right, we are here, of 17 18 course, for the purposes of sentencing following the jury trial 19 of Mr. Rangel-Rubio. I did want to say at the beginning the defendant had filed a motion for a new trial and renewed his 20 21 motion for acquittal and I have denied both of those motions. 22 I've issued a 15-page written order that addresses both and that 23 has been posted on the record. 24 With that, Mr. Rangel-Rubio, you appeared before this 25 Court on October 25th, 2022 accompanied by your attorney, Ms.

Brewington, for your jury trial. On October 31st, 2022, you were found guilty by a jury of your peers of Count 1 of the superseding indictment charging you with conspiracy to conceal, harbor and shield illegal aliens in violation of 8 USC Section 1324(a)(1)(A)(b)(1), Count 2 of the superseding indictment charging you with money-laundering conspiracy in violation of 18 USC Section 1956(h), Count 6 of the superseding indictment charging you with conspiracy to kill a witness in violation of 18 USC Section 1512(k) and Count 7 of the superseding indictment charging you with conspiracy to retaliate against a witness in violation of 18 USC Section 1513(f).

Following that jury's verdict, I directed the probation office to prepare a presentence report and to disclose that report to the Defense and to the Government.

Now, Mr. Rangel-Rubio, have you had the opportunity with the help of a translator to read that report and its brief addendum and with the help of an interpreter to discuss them with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And are there any objections remaining to that report including any objections to the probation officer's factual findings set forth in that report or to any of her conclusions about application of the advisory sentencing guidelines, any objections to that report on behalf of the Defense?

```
1
             MS. BREWINGTON: Judge, just overall, Mr. Rangel-Rubio
    does maintain his innocence, so we did an overall objection to
2
 3
    the recitation of facts but do not expect to have to flesh that
     all out today. We just wanted that on the record.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: On behalf of the United States, any
 6
    objections?
 7
                          No objections, Your Honor.
             MS. GROOVER:
             THE COURT: Then let me turn to you, Ms. Brewington.
8
9
    Are there any witnesses you'd like to call, evidence you'd like
10
    to bring forth or argument you would like to make in support of
11
     any objections to the factual statements that you've raised?
12
    The presentence report sets forth the factual background in
13
    Paragraph 7 through 28. It's my understanding that because Mr.
14
    Rangel-Rubio maintains his innocence, he objects to Paragraphs 7
     through 28. Is there any elaboration you would like to make on
15
16
    that, proof to offer?
             MS. BREWINGTON: No, Judge. We just wanted that for the
17
18
    record.
19
             THE COURT: And the record will reflect that you are
20
    maintaining innocence and object to those facts as set forth in
21
    Paragraphs 7 through 28.
22
             I do overrule those objections. I was the trial judge
    in the case and was present for, of course, all of the evidence
23
24
    that was brought forth that overwhelmingly established guilt of
25
    the charges that were set forth and by a preponderance of the
```

1 evidence showed that the facts that are recited in Paragraphs 7

2 | through 28 are certainly supported by the evidence that was

3 brought forth through the trial, and a jury of Mr.

Rangel-Rubio's peers found that he was guilty and heard that evidence, and as a result, I find that a preponderance of the credible evidence does support the facts as set forth in

7 Paragraphs 7 through 28.

I find beyond a reasonable doubt the evidence set forth in Paragraphs 7 through 28 was supported by the evidence at trial and as a result the objections are overruled. As it relates to the paragraphs that were not objected to in the report, I'll adopt those as my findings of fact and also adopt all of the conclusions with regard to the advisory guidelines reached by the probation officer.

All those conclusions that were not objected to, I will adopt those as my conclusions and therefore determine in Mr.

Rangel-Rubio's case a total offense level of 43, a criminal history category of 1. That results in life imprisonment, one to three years of supervised release as to Counts 1 and 2, two to five years of supervised release as to Counts 6 and 7. The advisory guidelines are \$50,000 to \$500,000.00 fine, \$1,351,217.05 restitution, \$400.00 of special assessments.

As for the statutory penalties, for Count 1, there is no minimum term in prison required and there's a maximum of ten years in prison; as for Count 2, there is no minimum term of

```
1
     imprisonment required and there's a maximum of 20 years; and as
     for Counts 6 and 7, the statutory penalty is life in prison.
 2
 3
             Ms. Groover, let me turn to you. Are there any victims
    present who wish to make a statement regarding impact, financial
 4
 5
    or otherwise, that the instant offenses have had on them?
 6
             MS. GROOVER: Your Honor, I believe there are two
 7
    members of Mr. Montoya's family who would like to speak. There
    are others present, but may I confirm that if there are others
8
9
    who would like to speak?
10
             THE COURT: And as she's doing that, Mr. Rangel-Rubio,
11
    if you will have a seat.
12
             MS. GROOVER: Your Honor, there are two members who
    would like to address Your Honor.
13
14
             THE COURT: And if you'll call the first to the podium.
15
             MS. GROOVER: Yes, Your Honor. And they do speak
16
    Spanish. The first is Mr. Alvarez, who is Mr. Montoya's uncle.
17
             THE COURT: Okay.
18
             MR. ALVAREZ: A very good morning to everybody with the
19
    respect that everyone here is deserving of. So I would just
20
    like to reiterate this has been a very long case that's taken a
21
     long time to see come to its end but I would like to thank
22
    everybody involved in making it possible for this case to have
23
    gotten to this point and have been handled correctly and
    finalized.
24
25
             And lastly I would just like to say as far as the other
```

the Montoya family, my sister-in-law, my nephews, everybody, we

25

```
8
 1
    would just like to say thank you very much.
 2
             THE COURT:
                        Thank you, sir.
 3
             Ms. Groover, anyone else?
             MS. GROOVER: No, Your Honor.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: Ms. Brewington and Mr. Rangel-Rubio,
 6
    reapproach.
 7
             Ms. Brewington, as far as sentencing goes, are there any
    witnesses you'd like to call or evidence you'd like to bring
8
9
     forth or argument you would like to make in mitigation?
10
             MS. BREWINGTON: Argument, Judge.
11
             THE COURT: Proceed.
12
             MS. BREWINGTON: Thank you, Judge. In looking at the
13
     factors of USC 3553, I think there are different aspects of
14
    Juan's life that are important to highlight. He was born in
    Hidalgo, Mexico in conditions I don't think any of us could ever
15
16
    begin to understand. He grew up in such poverty that his
17
    extended family lived in a one-bedroom home. They had to walk
18
    half an hour every day for water. He received little to no
19
    education, about six formal years of education. He saw much
    violence and corruption and things that United States citizens
20
2.1
    are not used to.
22
             And for that, he came to the United States for a better
23
    life. Even though he came here, he remained in very close
    contact with his family and his children. He sent money
24
25
    regularly as much as he could and he maintained phone calls on a
```

weekly basis with his brothers, sisters and his children.

While he's been here and really his whole life he has been an extremely hard worker. He began work at Age 6. He entered the Mexican army and completed about five years of service with them.

And while here in the United States, he's mostly done construction and tree-trimming jobs. During the time of his arrest he was working about six to seven days a week.

It is definitely important to note that he was here for quite some time and he is a criminal history 1. There wasn't a lot of things that occurred before this case at hand before you today.

In getting to know Juan, he is an extremely religious man. He brought his Bible with him to every single day of the trial. He reads his Bible daily and plans to continue to do so.

And looking back at the evidence, Judge, I think one of the things that sticks out for me the most is the relationship that he had with Pablo, his codefendant. I think that he was a very much subordinate to Pablo. I think that is most evident when we look at the living conditions on the compound that these people were staying in.

Pablo had a brand-new home, a brand-new outbuilding, a plethora of land and Juan was living in an old dilapidated camper with his girlfriend. He was not living in -- I would say Pablo was living high on the hog in the things that they were

doing and Juan was not. He was very much a subordinate to what Pablo told him to do.

In looking at the sentence that Pablo got, he received 584 months. I believe the culpability between the two is similar, and so what I'm asking for The Court to do today is sentence Juan to 600 months. I think this serves the purpose of the USC 3553. It's a just punishment. It will deter further criminal conduct, and it promotes respect for the law, so that is what we're asking from The Court here today and Juan would like to speak when it is time and appropriate for him, Judge.

THE COURT: And I will hear from him last of all. If you two will have a seat and let me turn to Ms. Groover for the Government's position with regard to sentencing.

MS. GROOVER: Thank you, Your Honor. Many people come to America in search of a better life and they work hard when they are in this country just like the defendant did but not all of them kill to protect and conceal their crimes.

The defendant is an assassin. He is a cold-blooded killer who hunted down and shot Eluid Montoya, a federal whistleblower. This is not an accidental killing. This was not a crime of passion, and it was not a crime of opportunity. No, it was a premeditated assassination of a good man who blew the whistle on a multi-million dollar scheme to hire and mistreat illegal aliens, other people who came here to this country in search of a better life. The defendant killed a man who

believed in the rule of law. He killed a man who believed in standing up for what was right. He killed a man who believed in helping others who could not help themselves.

Mr. Montoya saw that his coworkers were mistreated by their supervisor, the defendant's brother. Mr. Montoya saw that Pablo, who was an illegal alien, was also hiring other illegal aliens and not paying them for all the hours that they worked including Juan Ramirez, an individual who is seeking restitution today.

Mr. Montoya saw that his coworkers would sometimes get injured on the job and they couldn't get the medical treatment that they needed because of these working conditions.

Mr. Montoya saw his coworkers would sometimes go weeks without pay and they struggled financially not knowing when their next paychecks would come because Pablo, the defendant's brother, was holding them.

Mr. Montoya reported these injustices to the company, and what happened? His complaint was given to Pablo, and Mr. Montoya was written up for safety violations, something that Mr. Montoya disagreed with.

But that didn't stop him, Mr. Montoya, from standing up for what was right and what he believed in. He kept on. After he was suspended on one day, the next day he reported this to the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and he had planned to go to department of labor on Monday, that

following Monday. Mr. Montoya took this case to the federal, to the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and blew the whistle on a 3.5-million-dollar scheme.

But he never got the chance to go to the department of labor on Monday as he had planned because the defendant was planning to kill him.

Juan made plans. While Mr. Montoya was planning to right a wrong, Juan was planning to kill him. The defendant is illegally in this country, stealing over -- personally stealing over \$500,000.00 from this illegal scheme, living on the land with his brother and his family, willing to kill to protect it all.

He killed Mr. Montoya to punish him for complaining because he threatened to take away everything from him and his family. He also killed him to prevent him from going any further. He shot him five times, and several of those shots were fatal, not once, but five times, one of which went inside his mouth to shut him up from talking, to prevent him from going any further. It was also a symbolic killing, not just a premeditation assassination.

The defendant killed a son to Mr. Montoya's mother. He killed a brother to Mr. Montoya's brothers and sisters. He killed a nephew to Mr. Montoya's uncle. He killed a husband to his wife. He killed a father to his daughters. He killed a provider for a family. He stole all of it and left the family

```
13
    without their son, their brother, their husband, their father,
 1
 2
     their provider, their rock.
 3
             He took the life of a good man, and justice requires
     that he spend the rest of his life in prison. In addition,
 4
     justice would also demand restitution. United States is
 5
 6
     requesting restitution in the amount of $1,326,000.00 payable to
 7
    Maria Montoya for the loss of future wages of Mr. Montoya, and
    restitution in the amount of $21,804.25 payable to Juan Ramirez
 8
 9
     for the lost wages when he worked for Pablo, a scheme that the
10
     defendant benefited from.
11
             Thank you, Your Honor.
12
             THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Groover.
             Ms. Brewington and Mr. Rangel-Rubio, reapproach.
13
14
             And Ms. Brewington, I understand that the Defense is
15
    maintaining innocence, but with regard to the amount of
16
     restitution that the probation officer recommends and that the
    victim letters indicate, is there any dispute about the amount?
17
18
             MS. BREWINGTON: There is not, Judge.
19
             THE COURT: All right, well, Mr. Rangel-Rubio, let me
20
     turn to you. It is your opportunity to address me last. Is
21
     there anything you would like to say before I decide your
22
    punishment?
23
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes.
24
             THE COURT: Proceed.
```

THE DEFENDANT: Well, before anything else, I want to

25

apologize to this Court and to the United States, people of the United States. I want to apologize for coming to this country illegally. I also want to apologize for putting my life in danger by removing trees that are close to the power lines, trees that are on top of houses and trees that put in risk, are in risk of causing disasters during tornadoes and hurricanes and storms and working very hard for so that the power companies can restore power and so that hundreds and thousands of Americans can go back to their homes.

I want to apologize for being such an ignorant person that doesn't know that being a hard worker is illegal in this country. I also want to tell Mrs. Montoya and the Montoya family that I didn't kill her husband and their brother. And that I -- I feel their loss. Montoya was a coworker and we worked together often.

I'm sorry, Ms. Montoya and the Montoya family, but Mr. Montoya was not the person that they showed in this court. I know that he's dead. He cannot defend himself, but many of us know he did like they said help many families. But at the same time he took advantage of them when he helped them.

In 2009, Mr. Refugio Ramirez was stopped by police. And his truck was seized. Mr. Montoya offered helping him to get the truck out of impound. But he never returned the truck to Mr. Refugio Ramirez. Two or three years after that, two or three years later, Mr. Montoya stole from Jose Cortez Martinez

more than \$5,000.00 for his taxes. One or two years before his death, he told me that during tax time he would make more than \$60,000.00. That's the year he bought the truck to work, to do the tree work.

Montoya family, Mrs. Montoya, maybe you didn't know what Mr. Montoya did, but he had many enemies out there. I know that you, your children, your brothers hurt a lot with his death.

But I want you to know that I'm innocent and that I'm going to pay for a crime I did not commit and the real guilty person is out there walking out there free.

We're in a country that likes to call itself the most powerful in the world and with the best technology. And they couldn't find real evidence, nothing that would show, point out the real murderer.

And do you know why? Because these people in the government, "professional" is only a name. They don't like to work and they always take the easiest way.

I apologize, Ms. Montoya, for these words and also Montoya family. And I ask for the favor to think if you -- if you really think that the Government had the evidence to find me guilty, without real evidence, and also through -- and only through lies of people because we all know that the witnesses were all fake witnesses.

Today is the third time that I hear a lie from the Government. Initially they said that Mr. Montoya had been shot

three times. During the trial they said that Mr. Montoya had been shot six times. And now madam district attorney said that he was shot five times. Which one is the truth?

I know that you didn't see, referring to the evidence, that the Government had against me. But there were many things that the Government, they said that they think, only they think. You saw me here during the trial. I've always been calm. And I've said it before. I met God, and now that I met God I say it again, I have never been afraid of dying or of prison or anything.

If Mr. Montoya were here, he would tell you about so many times that I risked my life with trees that were very dangerous on top of the power lines, that nobody in the company wanted to do that job and Americans much less.

Sirs, ma'am, Your Honor, I came to this country to work and I've worked all my life. As my attorney said, I started working when I started walking. I left my family 14 to go work away from the family. I always worked hard. At the beginning because I was so young it was difficult to find a job in Mexico City.

Well, I worked in construction for years. After I was eight I started in the military. And I also wanted to say that I've always been responsible at my job. It was what my father taught me. And in this place in the United States since the year 2000 when I entered this country, I always worked hard to

earn a place at work. At the company, the Wolf Tree Company, I started working there in 2003 in Nashville, Tennessee.

As I said before, if the Government had investigated my life, they would have a different image of myself. But unfortunately I was not able to present witnesses to testify in my favor and tell the truth because in the company everybody knew that I was a wonderful worker.

I was accused of harboring and hiring illegals. But I never hired anybody because I was never a supervisor. I was just a worker. If my brother was doing that things, only he knew, or, well, Oscar Cruz did, too, because he was also a supervisor. My brother would only pay me my check. If I made money, it was because as well as Mr. Montoya I also worked Saturdays and Sundays. His family knows about that because we worked together sometimes.

Regarding the money laundering, well, as I told my attorneys from the beginning, that money would come to my account but it was not my money. I never stole one dollar from the workers.

But, you know, if the money was in my account and the account -- and the account was my account, what can I say? As well as Mr. Montoya sometimes I would help other coworkers if they were paid with a check and they didn't have -- they didn't have an account or they didn't have an ID.

And as I've told everybody and my attorneys, I'm going

to come back with a witnesses because the Government never questioned, never interrogated people that I told them that were the owners of the money that was in my account. And as I said, they all always take the easy way and I've been here by myself from the beginning. I hope you understand me and I hope that you -- I apologize.

And, well, I said I'm going to come back -- I don't know when -- to show my innocence and -- and fight my case. I want to fight my case and show my innocence, I'm sorry.

I know that I need an attorney later for that and that I need a lot of money, money that I don't have. As I've told many people, I'm going to wash clothes, clean cells, sell candy until I have enough money to pay for an attorney.

I also want to ask this Court if it's possible -- if it's possible, Your Honor, if you could send me to a prison close to my family where my family can come visit. And I don't know, Your Honor, how many options there are, but I have family in Texas, in New Mexico, in Oklahoma and Florida, and I would like to be housed in one of those places.

What I've learned from other people that have been in federal prisons, I know that I'm going to be sent to a maximum security prison, maybe not maximum security but high security prison. And I know that it's -- I know that it's dangerous in those prisons. But as I -- I've told many people, as I just said in this court, I'm not afraid of anything because I'm not

looking for enemies. I've never been a person creating problems.

And well, I think the Government knows it because when Ms. Christina -- Christina Bishop went to Mexico to investigate my life there, I don't think that she was able to find any -- any bad record about me. I know that the only thing she was able to find was the way of life there, the way we grew up, and, well, she was the one who brought with her my military record.

Here in this court the Government portrayed me as a cold-blooded killer because of my military record and professional killer, but I want to say, to tell you in front of all of you, that is a lie. The only training I had when I joined the army was basic training, two months.

After that they sent me to the southern region of Mexico to the state of Chiapas to work building roads, hospitals, parks, to help the people in Chiapas, after the guerillas in 1994. I didn't go there to fight. I went there to work. As I said, I've worked all my life.

I want to go back for a moment to something that my attorney said. My brother was the boss. And when I told my attorneys before Ms. Kathy was that my brother really, he lived like a king, while I lived like my attorney said in a -- in a camper that was falling apart because it was so old. That means I didn't have money.

When I was arrested I had about \$2,000.00 in my account.

That's very little money for a person that works seven days a week. I've told many people that I feel like my brother took advantage of me as well as of other people. He took advantage of the fact that I was a hard worker. And, well, as everybody knows I always worked out in the country. And my brother never, never checked on me because he knew that I was a very hard worker.

And while he used that time that he didn't have to use supervising me at work, he used that time to travel. And as I've told many people my story, he traveled all over the United States. In fact, I spoke about to one of my sisters because he often went to Texas while I would stay here working.

I didn't get any extra money. Even the company saved a lot of money or he did -- I don't know who kept that money -- but I also did mechanical work at the company. I saved them thousands of dollars but I didn't get any of that money. As I said, I was just happy with my check and with what I made on weekends, Saturdays and Sundays.

I know, well, maybe nothing of what I say now will convince other people. Well, I say one more time, I'm innocent of his death and I'm also innocent I could say of the money because even though the money went to my account I didn't steal money from anybody.

And well, I'm in your hands. I'm not going to cry because crying only makes things worse. I'm going to be strong,

2.1

and as I said from the beginning I'm going to trust God and I'm going to accept whatever God has for me.

Thank you, God bless you. That's all.

place. Of course, I've listened to the defendant, Mr.

Rangel-Rubio, today and to his attorney, listened to counsel for the Government, am very familiar with the facts of the case having presided over the trial. I've studied the presentence report and its addendum and I've given a great deal of thought to each of the Section 3553 factors as they apply uniquely to Mr. Rangel-Rubio.

THE COURT: Mr. Rangel-Rubio, you need to remain in

In particular, I've considered at length the factor the nature of the offense. Here we have among the most serious offenses. I've considered the nature of the offender, both the good and the bad regarding Mr. Rangel-Rubio, and it's clear on the good side of things, Mr. Rangel-Rubio has been a hard worker. He's talked today about some of the dangerous work that he's done with the tree removal and so forth.

I've considered the negative things about Mr.

Rangel-Rubio. I've considered the need to promote deterrence,

both general and specific, the need to promote respect for the

law and the need for the punishment to reflect the seriousness

of the underlying conduct.

I did listen, Mr. Rangel-Rubio, to your semi-veiled but fully weak attempts to tear down Mr. Montoya and the government

witnesses who built a strong case against you here in this courtroom.

The evidence at trial showed that the victim, Mr. Eluid Montoya, took a brave and righteous path to complain to the EEOC about mistreatment, and in response to Mr. Montoya voicing complaints, you conspired to shoot him in the mouth. You took his life. Mr. Montoya will never spend another day anywhere else on this earth.

As a result, it is proper that you spend all your remaining days in prison. It is the judgment of The Court that the defendant, Mr. Juan Rangel-Rubio, is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be in prison for a term of life. That term will consist of imprisonment of 120 months as to Count 1, 240 months as to Count 2 and life imprisonment as to each of Counts 6 and 7, all to be served concurrently.

Upon release from confinement, you will be delivered to a duly authorized immigration and customs enforcement officer for deportation proceedings.

I find no reason to depart from the sentence called for by application of the advisory guidelines. The facts that were found are all accounted for in this sentencing guideline calculation. Restitution is due in the total amount of \$1,351,217.05. That will consist of \$21,804.25 paid to Juan Ramirez and \$1,329,412.80 paid to Maria Montoya. That restitution owed to Ms. Montoya is joint and several with Pablo

Rangel-Rubio's restitution obligations in Case Number 4:22-30 and Higinio Perez-Bravo's restitution obligations in Case 4:18-CR-274.

And restitution owed to Mr. Ramirez is joint and several with Pablo Rangel-Rubio's restitution obligations in Docket Number 4:22-30.

Of course, the economic circumstances of this Mr.

Rangel-Rubio do not allow for payment in full of that large restitution obligation, and as a result, pursuant to 18 USC Section 3664(f)(3)(B), nominal payments of either quarterly installments of a minimum of \$25.00 if working non-UNICOR or a minimum of 50 percent of monthly earnings if working UNICOR shall be paid, and then upon release from imprisonment and while on supervised release, nominal payments of \$300.00 per month shall be made. Those payments will be made payable to the Clerk of the US District Court for disbursement to the victim.

I've determined that Mr. Rangel-Rubio does not have the ability to pay interest and so I'm going to waive the interest requirements, nor does he have the ability to pay a fine, and so pursuant to the guidelines, I'm not going to order a fine payment. There is \$400.00 special assessment -- that is \$100.00 per count -- that is due immediately.

I do recommend to the Bureau of Prisons that to the extent space and security can accommodate his request, I do recommend that Mr. Rangel-Rubio be placed in a facility perhaps

in Texas or New Mexico or Oklahoma or Florida so that he can be placed near family who can visit him during his lifetime of incarceration.

If he is released from imprisonment, then he will be on supervised release for a term of five years. That term will consist of three years as to each of Counts 1 and 2 and five years as to each of Counts 6 and 7 all to be served concurrently.

While on supervised release, he will comply with all the standard conditions of supervision required by The Court and all the mandatory terms of supervised release that are required by federal law. Those will include a prohibition against the possession of any firearm or dangerous weapon, a prohibition against the violation of any law. He will cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample as directed by Probation. I've determined based on the specific facts of this case that certain special conditions are in order and I order those special conditions acknowledging that they do entail some deprivation of liberty but nevertheless have decided that they are important and order them as follows.

If he is released on supervised release and ordered deported from the United States, he must remain outside the United States unless legally authorized to reenter.

If he does reenter the United States, he must report to the nearest probation officer within 72 hours after returning.

2.1

If he's not deported, he must report to the nearest probation officer within 72 hours of release from custody.

He must provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information and authorize the release of that financial information and that may be shared with the US Attorney's Office.

He must not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer and he must pay the financial penalty in accordance with the schedule of payment sheets that will accompany this judgment.

He must not communicate or otherwise interact with the family of Eluid Montoya. That means Jose Luis Santos Gutierrez, Ricardo Ramirez Benitez, Stanley Turner, Charles Tilson, Jerad Brown, Ruben Hernandez Ramirez, Joel Reyes Pena or Juan Ramirez. All of those individuals he must not have either direct or indirect contact without obtaining first the permission from the probation officer.

I also order as a special condition of supervised release if applicable that he be subject to certain searches as directed by Probation but only based on a reasonable suspicion of a violation of one of these terms and only conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner.

The probation officer is hereby directed to provide Mr. Rangel-Rubio with a written set of instructions that governs all the terms of his supervised release.

Mr. Rangel-Rubio, it's my duty to advise you that you now have the right to appeal this sentence and conviction 14 days from today's date. A failure to file a timely appeal within 14 days of today's date would result in a waiver of your right to appeal. The Government may likewise file an appeal from this sentence. You're also advised that you have the right to the assistance of an attorney in making any such appeal and if you are unable to afford an attorney, which I understand you are not, if you are unable to afford an attorney, you're entitled to the assistance of an attorney at no charge to you, and Ms. Brewington, you are to remain as his attorney for the purposes of making any such appeal.

In the event of an appeal, it will be the obligation and responsibility of your counsel to continue her representation on appeal unless and until relieved by order of the Court of Appeals.

Mr. Rangel-Rubio, I'll also inform you that if you so request, the clerk of court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf.

Well, sentence has now been pronounced. Other than the objections that were made and ruled upon, do you now have any objections to my findings of fact, my conclusions of law, or to the manner in which sentence was pronounced, Ms. Brewington?

MS. BREWINGTON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And Ms. Groover?

	27
1	MS. GROOVER: No objections.
2	THE COURT: All right, then Mr. Rangel-Rubio, I'll
3	remand you to the custody of the US Marshal and counsel, we will
4	be in recess.
5	(Proceeding concluded at 11:41 a.m.)
6	CERTIFICATION
7	
8	I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct
9	transcript of the stenographic record of the above-mentioned
10	matter.
11	
12	Debra DGilbs
14	06/05/2023
15	Debra Gilbert, Court Reporter Date
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	